arXiv:1603.06385v2 [math.DS] 7 May 2016

Consensus and Voting on Large Graphs: An Application of Graph Limit Theory

Barton E. A. Lee

School of Mathematics and Statistics
The University of New South Wales
Sydney NSW 2052, Australia
barton.lee@unswalumni.com

May 10, 2016

Abstract

Building on recent work by Medvedev (2014) we establish new connections between a basic consensus model, called the voting model, and the theory of graph limits. We show that in the voting model if consensus is attained in the continuum limit then solutions to the finite model will eventually be close to a constant function, and a class of graph limits which guarantee consensus is identified. Additionally, we introduce the notion of perturbed graph sequences as a tool to model noisy data or random shocks, and investigate consensus on perturbed systems. Finally, it is proven that the dynamics in the continuum limit can be decomposed as a direct sum of dynamics on the connected components, using Janson's definition of connectivity for graph limits. This implies that without loss of generality it may be assumed that the continuum voting model occurs on a connected graph limit.

1 Introduction

Given a group of agents voting on whether or not to implement a policy, when and how can the group come to an agreement? This is a consensus problem. Models and algorithms which solve consensus problems are important in the theory of control systems [14, Section 16.2] and economics [8]. In this paper we focus on a particular model of the consensus problem called the *voting model*. This model fits into the framework considered by Medvedev [15], who applied graph limit theory to dynamical systems.

Our key result shows that if the solution to the continuum limit of the voting model reaches consensus then solutions to the finite model on sufficiently large graphs will eventually be close to a constant function. Futhermore, building on our concept of twin-kernels a class of graph limits which guarantee consensus is identified. We introduce a notion of perturbed graph sequences which can model noisy data and random shocks and then prove a convergence result for solutions to the voting model on perturbed graph sequences. A close relationship between the dynamics of the voting model on sets of weakly isomorphic graph limits is shown. Finally, we prove that the dynamics in the continuum limit can be decomposed as a direct sum of the dynamics on connected components. This means that without loss of generality we may assume that the dynamics of the continuum model occur on a connected graph limit. These results provide motivation for the continued study of graph limit theory in the consensus protocol literature.

The structure of the remainder of this paper is as follows. In Section 2 we will give a brief introduction to the voting model in the finite setting and Section 3 will review some basic results from the graph limit theory literature whilst also introducing a notion of perturbed graph sequences. Section 4 extends the model to the continuum setting and Section 5 analyses solutions on connected components. Finally Section 6 studies consensus in the continuum model and its relationship with the finite model.

Some of the results (such as Corollary 4.7, Lemma 4.9, Corollary 4.10, Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 6.7) presented in this paper extend easily to the more general class of nonlinear heat equation initial value problems considered by Medvedev in [15]. Other results such as Theorem 6.1 and Proposition 6.8 rely on the Conservation Law (Lemma 5.1) and may be extended with this added condition. The remaining results rely on specific aspects of the voting model we consider. However, in any case the methods used throughout this paper may prove useful for researchers interested in initial value problems on large graphs and results about consensus.

2 Finite voting model

Various voting models have been formulated in the literature [1, 5]. We focus on an elementary form which is also studied in [17] and [21]. Section 4 will then extend the voting model to a new setting.

We first begin with some basic definitions from graph theory:

A graph is an ordered pair of sets, say $G = (V, E)$, with V denoting the vertex set and E denoting the edge set of the graph. The elements of E are two element subsets of V. This

definition implies that the graph is simple; that is, the edge set contains no loops or multiple edges. For more information on graphs we refer the reader to [4].

An *edge-weighted graph* is a graph $H = (V, E)$ together with a sequence $\{\beta_{ij}\}_{i,j\in V}$ of real *edge weights*, such that $\beta_{ij} = \beta_{ji}$ for all $i, j \in V$ and if $\beta_{ij} \neq 0$ then $\{i, j\}$ is an edge of H. A simple graph is a special case of an edge-weighted graph where edge weights are 0-1 valued with $\beta_{ii} = 0$ for all $i \in V$. For notational simplicity we will only consider edge weights which are contained in the interval $[-1, 1]$. The results in this paper follow similarly for edge weights contained in any larger interval say $[-M, M]$ for some $M > 1$.

Given an edge-weighted graph G on vertex set $[n] := \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ with edge weights $\{\beta_{ij}\}_{i,j\in[n]}$, our voting model arises from the following process. Begin with a set of voters $[n]$, each with initial opinions denoted by $u_i(0) \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i \in [n]$. The influence of voter i on voter j $(i, j \in [n])$ is represented by the edge weight β_{ij}. At each time step (or infinitesimal), every voter $i \in [n]$ independently and uniformly at random chooses another voter $j \in [n]$ and updates their opinion such that

$$\frac{\Delta u_i(t)}{\Delta t} = \beta_{ij}\Big(u_j(t) - u_i(t)\Big). \tag{2.1}$$

If $\beta_{ij} = 1$, then (2.1) implies that voter i adopts voter j's opinion in the next time step, while if $\beta_{ij} = -1$, then voter i will diverge from voter j's opinion in the next time step.

The quantity of focus in this paper will be the expected value attained from (2.1). That is,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta u_i(t)}{\Delta t}\right] = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\beta_{ij}\Big(u_j(t) - u_i(t)\Big). \tag{2.2}$$

Equivalently, the right hand side of (2.2) could be realised, without the expectation operator, by considering a model which at each stage every voter updates their opinion based on the average of the voters in the graph, scaled according to the edge weights β_{ij}.

It should be noted that this process represents more general systems than voters with opinions. In particular, the aforementioned process has been used in autonomous vehicle control systems [22], to model the spread of alcohol abuse [7] and neuronal-network activity [19].

We will exclusively consider time to be continuous with $t \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$. Thus the voting process described above can be expressed as an initial value problem (IVP). Vectors and vector-valued functions will be written in bold font whilst components will not.

For any positive integer n, let $\boldsymbol{g} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let H_n be an edge-weighted graph with vertex set $[n]$ and edge weights $\{\beta_{ij}\}_{i,j\in[n]}$. Then the evolution of voters' opinions is described by

the solution $\boldsymbol{u} : \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ of the IVP

$$\begin{cases} \frac{du_i(t)}{dt} & = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} \Big(u_j(t) - u_i(t) \Big) \qquad \text{for all } \ i \in [n] \text{ and } t \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}, \\ \boldsymbol{u}(0) & = \boldsymbol{g}. \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

We now define consensus, which will be a key focus of Section 5.

Definition 2.1. For any positive integer n, let $\boldsymbol{g} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let H_n be an edge-weighted graph on vertex set $[n]$. If $\boldsymbol{u}$ is a solution to (2.3) such that

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \max_{i,j \in [n]} |u_i(t) - u_j(t)| = 0, \tag{2.4}$$

then we say *consensus* is attained by $\boldsymbol{u}$.

Example 2.2. For any positive integer n, let H_n be an edge-weighted graph on the vertex set $[n]$ such that the edge weights are all equal to 1. Then H_n will attain consensus for every initial condition vector $\boldsymbol{g} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Whilst, if the edge weights are all equal to -1 then $\boldsymbol{u}$ reaches consensus if and only if $\boldsymbol{g}$ is a constant-valued vector. $\diamond$

The intial value problem (2.3) can be expressed as a linear system of differential equations. Let B be an $n \times n$ matrix with $B_{ij} = \beta_{ij}$ for each $i, j \in [n]$ and let $\overline{\beta_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij}$ for each $i \in [n]$. By considering the matrix $D = \frac{1}{n}\big(B - \operatorname{diag}(\overline{\beta_1}, \overline{\beta_2}, \ldots, \overline{\beta_n})\big)$ we can equivalently write (2.3) as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d\boldsymbol{u}(t)}{dt} & = D\, \boldsymbol{u}(t), \\ \boldsymbol{u}(0) & = \boldsymbol{g}. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

The IVP (2.5) has a unique solution

$$\boldsymbol{u}(t) = e^{Dt}\, \boldsymbol{g}, \tag{2.6}$$

so questions of interest such as whether the agents reach a consensus and the time taken to arrive at this consensus are completely determined via the eigenvalues of the (real, symmetric) matrix D.

3 Graph limit theory

The theory of graph limits was introduced by Lovász and Szegedy in 2006 [13] and then further developed in a series of papers by Borgs et al. [2, 3]. A key goal of Lovász and

Szegedy was to understand large graph structures by characterising convergence for sequences of graphs which grow unboundedly, thereby constructing a natural 'limit object'.

In Section 3.1 we present some basic definitions and results from the theory of graph limits, and describe a canonical example of a convergent graph sequence. We introduce the definition of a perturbed graph sequence in Section 3.2. In Section 3.3 we review the appropriate notion of connectivity for graph limits. For an overview of the theory and its applications we refer the interested reader to the excellent monograph by Lovász [12].

3.1 Preliminaries

The theory of graph limits is motivated using the graph-theoretic notion of a homomorphism density. This notion is then used to define convergence of graph sequences. Alternatively, we will focus on an equivalent definition formulated using a metric which we review in this section.

Throughout this paper we will use the term measurable, this will always refer to the Lebesgue measure with Borel σ-algebra. It is also important to note that a number of the definitions and results reviewed in this section have been stated without an additional necessary requirement of *uniformly bounded edge weights* since this is automatically satisfied by our assumption that edge weights are contained in $[-1, 1]$. Lastly, since this paper is only concerned with edge-weighted graphs rather than both vertex and edge weighted graphs, we will restrict some definitions to this special case without explicit warning.

Let H be an edge-weighted graph, the *pixel kernel of* H is a measurable function from $[0, 1]^2$ to $[-1, 1]$ which represents the graph H and is denoted by W_H. The construction is as follows: let $H = (V, E)$ be an edge-weighted graph with edge weights $\{\beta_{ij}\}_{i,\, j\in V}$. Partition $[0, 1]$ into $|V|$ measurable subsets of equal measure, say $\{I_i\}_{i\in V}$. Then define the pixel kernel of H:

$$W_H(x, y) = \beta_{ij} \qquad \text{if } (x, y) \in I_i \times I_j \text{ for some } i, j \in V. \tag{3.1}$$

This construction is not unique, however given a graph, the set of pixel kernels arising via (3.1) can be considered to be equivalent via the weakly isomorphic relation (defined later).

We now introduce the cut norm which is used to construct the cut distance and define convergence for graph sequences. Let W be a pixel kernel the *cut norm* of W is

$$\|W\|_\square = \sup_{S,T\subseteq[0,1]} \left| \int_{S\times T} W(x, y)\, dx\, dy \right|,$$

where the subsets S, T are required to be measurable. Given a pixel kernel U and a map φ from $[0,1]$ to $[0,1]$ we define the φ *pull-back* of U by $U^\varphi : (x,y) \mapsto U(\varphi(x), \varphi(y))$. Let $S[0,1]$ denote the set of measure-preserving maps from $[0,1]$ into $[0,1]$. Then the *cut distance* between two pixel kernels W, U is

$$\delta_\square(W,U) = \inf_{\varphi \in S[0,1]} \|W - U^\varphi\|_\square.$$

It should be noted that this 'distance' function is only a pseudo-distance function. This issue can be rectified by considering the quotient space of weakly isomorphic kernels (to be defined), however, we will not need to explicitly consider the quotient space in this paper.

Definition 3.1. [2, Theorem 2.6]
A sequence of edge-weighted graphs $\{H_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is said to *converge* if $\{W_{H_n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence with respect to the cut distance.

An interesting consequence of this definition is that the space of graphs, or equivalently pixel kernels, is not closed under the cut distance. We now consider the larger space of kernels which defines the completion of this space [2, Corollary 3.9].

Definition 3.2. A kernel is symmetric, measurable function $W : [0,1]^2 \to [-1,1]$. In the special case that $W : [0,1]^2 \to [0,1]$ we call W a *graphon*. We denote the set of all kernels and graphons by $\mathcal{W}_1$ and $\mathcal{W}_0$, respectively.

Informally a kernel (or graphon) can be thought of as a generalisation of the adjacency matrix of an edge-weighted graph which has a continuum number of vertices. It should be noted that the cut norm and cut distance definitions extend naturally to the larger space of kernels.

We now define convergence of a graph sequence to a kernel via the cut distance.

Definition 3.3. [2, Theorem 2.6]
Let $\{H_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of edge-weighted graphs and let $W \in \mathcal{W}$. Then $H_n \to W$ as $n \to \infty$ if and only if $\delta_\square(W_{H_n}, W) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

A useful observation which will be used throughout this paper is the following:

$$\delta_\square(W,U) \leq \|W - U\|_\square \leq \|W - U\|_2, \tag{3.2}$$

here $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the L_2-norm on $[0,1]^2$. Thus, convergence in L_2-norm of a sequence of a pixel kernels (recall the construction given in (3.1)) is sufficient to prove convergence of a sequence of graphs with respect to Definition 3.1.

We now introduce the *weakly isomorphic* relation, denoted $\sim$, which identifies sets of kernels which all have a cut distance of zero apart [12, Corollary 10.34]. Let $W, U \in \mathcal{W}_1$ be kernels, we say that W and U are weakly isomorphic if and only if

$$\delta_\square(U, W) = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

This relationship can also be characterised using measure-preserving maps.

Theorem 3.4. [12, Section 8.2.5 and Corollary 10.35(a)]
A pair of kernels $W, U \in \mathcal{W}_1$ are weakly isomorphic if and only if there exists two measure-preserving maps, say $\varphi, \phi \in S[0,1]$, such that

$$W^\varphi = U^\phi \qquad \textit{almost everywhere.}$$

In the special case that W and U are step kernels; that is, kernels which are also step functions, then there exists a pair of invertible measure-preserving maps which satisfy the above statement.

It should be noted that for every edge-weighted graph H the pixel kernel of H is a step kernel. We now present a canonical example of a graph sequence which converges to a given kernel. This construction was utilised by [15] and will be referred to throughout this paper.

Example 3.5. [15, Section 5] Given $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$, for every positive integer n define the partition $\mathcal{P}_n$ of $[0,1]$ by

$$\mathcal{P}_n = \left\{ I_i^n : I_i^n = \left(\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n} \right] \text{ for } i \in [n] \right\}.$$

For completeness we can redefine $I_1^n = \left[0, \frac{1}{n}\right]$, however, it makes no difference for the results that follow. We now construct the sequence of edge-weighted graphs H_n on vertex set $[n]$ with edge weights

$$\beta_{ij}^n = n^2 \int_{I_i^n \times I_j^n} W(x,y)\, dx\, dy \qquad \text{for all } i, j \in [n].$$

Medvedev [15] proved that W_{H_n} converges to W in L_2-norm; that is

$$\|W - W_{H_n}\|_2 \to 0 \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Then by (3.2) and Definition 3.3 this suffices to prove that the graph sequence $\{H_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to W. $\diamond$

Remark 3.6. The L_2-bound utilised in Example 3.5 may seem unnecessarily large, since the L_1-norm would have sufficed to prove the same result. Indeed this is true. The L_2-norm has been chosen with hindsight and will be referred back to in Lemma 4.4 and Corollary 4.7.

3.2 Perturbed graph sequences and convergence

This section will introduce a new concept of perturbed graph sequences which allow limited amounts of variation in the edge sets of graphs in a given sequence. This concept aims to model the degree of uncertainty present in observations of real life networks.

Definition 3.7. For each positive integer n, let H_n and H'_n be edge-weighted graphs on the same vertex set V_n with edge weights denoted by $\{\beta^n_{ij}\}_{i,j\in V_n}$ and $\{\beta'^n_{ij}\}_{i,j\in V_n}$, respectively. Suppose that the graph sequences $\{H_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, \{H'_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ have edge weights uniformly contained in $[-1,1]$ and there exists a function $r(n) \in o(n^2)$ such that

$$\left|\left\{(i,j) \in V_n^2 : \beta^n_{ij} \neq \beta'^n_{ij}\right\}\right| \leq r(n) \qquad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then we say that $\{H'_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a $o(n^2)$-*perturbation* of the graph sequence $\{H_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

We now prove that convergence to a graph limit is robust to perturbations of graph sequences.

Lemma 3.8. *For each positive integer n, let H_n be an edge-weighted graph on the vertex set $[n]$. If the graph sequence $\{H_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to the kernel $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$ then any $o(n^2)$-perturbation of $\{H_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, say $\{H'_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, also converges to W.*

Proof. Denote the edge weights of H_n and H'_n as β^n_{ij} and β'^n_{ij}, respectively. Define the following pixel kernels of H_n and H'_n (see 3.1)

$$W_n = W_{H_n} \quad \text{and} \quad W'_n = W_{H'_n} \qquad \text{for every positive integer } n.$$

Both of these kernels have n^2 steps in $[0,1]^2$ of measure $\frac{1}{n^2}$. Since $\{H'_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a $o(n^2)$-perturbation of $\{H_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, there exists a function $r(n) \in o(n^2)$ such that

$$\left|\left\{(i,j) \in [n]^2 : \beta^n_{ij} \neq \beta'^n_{ij}\right\}\right| \leq r(n) \qquad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.4}$$

Further, since both graph sequences $\{H_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{H'_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ have edges weights uniformly contained in $[-1,1]$. For every positive integer n, we have

$$|\beta^n_{ij} - \beta'^n_{ij}| \leq 2 \qquad \text{for all } i,j \in [n]. \tag{3.5}$$

As seen in Example 3.5, to prove $H'_n \to W$ it suffices to prove that $\delta_\square(W'_n, W) \to 0$. Using the triangle inequality and 3.2 we attain the following upper bound:

$$\delta_\square(W'_n, W) \leq \delta_\square(W'_n, W_n) + \delta_\square(W_n, W) \leq \|W'_n - W_n\|_2 + \delta_\square(W_n, W) \tag{3.6}$$

The second term can be made arbitrarily small for large n, since $H_n \to W$ by assumption. We now prove that the first term can also be made arbitrarily small for large n, by expressing the integral as a summation over the steps of W_n and W'_n, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|W_n - W'_n\|_2^2 &= \int_{[0,1]^2} \big(W_n(x,y) - W'_n(x,y)\big)^2 \, dx\, dy \\
&= \sum_{i,j\in[n]} (\beta_{ij}^n - \beta'^n_{ij})^2 \, \frac{1}{n^2} \\
&\le \sum_{i,j\in[n]} 2^2 \, \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{\beta_{ij}^n \neq \beta'^n_{ij}\}}}{n^2} && \text{by (3.5)} \\
&\le 4\,\frac{r(n)}{n^2} && \text{by (3.4).} \\
&= o(1). && (3.7)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the first term in (3.6) can be made arbitrarily small for large n and we conclude that $\delta_\square(W'_n, W) \to 0$. Applying Definition 3.3 proves that $H'_n \to W$ as $n \to \infty$, as required. $\square$

The size of the perturbation in Lemma 3.8 is tight in the following sense. Let $\{H_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of growing edge-weighted graphs. If $\{H'_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a perturbed edge-weighted graph sequence which alters cn^2 edges for some fixed $c > 0$, then $\{H_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{H'_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ need not converge to the same limit. To see this suppose that $c > 0$ is sufficiently small then for every positive integer n consider the simple graphs $G_n = ([n], \emptyset)$ and $G'_n = ([n], E')$ such that $|E'| = cn^2$. The cut distance between the pixel kernels of G_n and G'_n denoted by W_n and W'_n, respectively, will be $\delta_\square(W_n, W'_n) = c > 0$ for all positive integers n. Hence the graph sequences cannot converge to the same limit.

3.3 Connectivity in graph limit

We will make use of the notion of connectivity for graph limits, introduced by Janson [11], which we review here.

Definition 3.9. [11, Definition 1.12]
A kernel $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$ is *connected* if for every subset $S \subseteq [0,1]$ with $0 < \lambda(S) < 1$, we have

$$\int_{S\times\left([0,1]\setminus S\right)} |W(x,y)|\, dx\, dy > 0.$$

Here $\lambda(S)$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of the set $S \subseteq [0,1]$.

If two kernels are weakly isomorphic and one is connected, then so is the other [11, Theorem 1.16]. Hence we say that the equivalence class of kernels weakly isomorphic to W is connected if W is connected, and note that this is well-defined.

Janson proved that every kernel can be decomposed as a direct sum of connected kernels. To describe this decomposition we need some definitions. Given an interval $J = [M, N] \subseteq [0, 1]$, we define the nonnegative linear function of J onto $[0, 1]$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi : J &\to [0,1] \\ x &\mapsto \frac{x-M}{M-N} = \frac{x-M}{\lambda(J)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Definition 3.10. Let $\{W_i\}_{i\in I} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_1$ be a countable family of kernels and let $\{a_i\}_{i\in I}$ be a countable family of real postive numbers such that $\sum_{j\in I} a_i = 1$. Then the direct sum of $\{W_i\}_{i\in I}$ with weights $\{a_i\}_{i\in I}$ is the kernel denoted by

$$\bigoplus_{i\in I} a_i W_i \in \mathcal{W}_1. \tag{3.9}$$

We interpret (3.9) by partitioning $[0, 1]$ into intervals J_i of Lebesgue measure a_i for $i \in I$ and denoting the positive affine map of J_i onto $[0, 1]$ by ϕ_i (see (3.8)). Then

$$\Big(\bigoplus_{i\in I} a_i W_i\Big)(x, y) = \begin{cases} W_k\big(\phi_k(x), \phi_k(y)\big) & \text{if } x, y \in J_k \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{Z}^+, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

Lemma 3.11. [11, Theorem 1.5]
Let $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$. Then there exist a countable family of connected kernels, $\{W_i\}_{i\in I} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_1$, and a corresponding family of positive real numbers $\{a_i\}_{i\in I}$ with $\sum_{i\in I} a_i = 1$ such that

$$W = \bigoplus_{i\in I} a_i W_i.$$

4 Voting on large graphs and graph limits

Extending the voting model to kernels is motivated by two observations. Firstly, many modern-day networks such as the internet are for all practical purposes infinitely large. Thus it may be more appropriate to consider the voting model in the setting of graph limits. Secondly, the behaviour of solutions to the finite voting model are completely determined via eigenvalues and eigenvectors (recall (2.6)). However, for sufficiently large graphs it is computationally infeasible to compute these values and vectors. Approximating a large

graph by a kernel provides an alternative method for approximately solving the dynamics of the IVP (2.3) on the graph.

We begin by presenting the voting model on a kernel. Let $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$. Then the continuum limit of (2.3) can be expressed by $\boldsymbol{u} : \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \to L_\infty([0,1])$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u(x,t)}{\partial t} &= \int_0^1 W(x,y)\Big(u(y,t) - u(x,t)\Big)dy \qquad \text{for all } x \in [0,1] \text{ and } t \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}, \\ \boldsymbol{u}(0) &= \boldsymbol{g}. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Here, and throughout this paper, the integral sign refers to Lebesgue integration. Replacing IVPs such as (2.3) with the continuum limit has attracted interest in a number of papers [7, 20, 23]. However as pointed out by Medvedev [15], "a rigorous justification for taking the continuum limit in (such models) was lacking". In light of this, Medvedev [15] showed that the theory of graph limits could be used to prove that the continuum limit of such dynamical systems can approximate the dynamics on large finite graphs, under certain conditions.

First we present an existence and uniqueness result which shows that the continuum limit IVP (4.1) is well-posed; allowing the voting model to be extended to the continuum setting. The result considers the space of continuously differentiable vector-valued functions from $\mathbb{R}$ to $L_\infty([0,1])$, denoted by $C^1(\mathbb{R}, L_\infty([0,1]))$. This space is equipped with the following norm: let $\boldsymbol{u} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, L_\infty([0,1]))$ then

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{C(\mathbb{R}, L_\infty([0,1]))} = \sup_{0 \leq t < \infty} \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_\infty = \sup_{0 \leq t < \infty} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{x \in [0,1]} |u(x,t)|, \tag{4.2}$$

where ess sup denotes the essential supremum. The theorem follows as a special case of [15, Theorem 3.2].

Theorem 4.1. (Existence and Uniqueness)
Let $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty\big([0,1]\big)$. Then the IVP (4.1) has a unique solution in $C^1\Big(\mathbb{R}, L_\infty\big([0,1]\big)\Big)$.

For the remainder of this paper when we refer to 'the' solution of the IVP (4.1) this will always mean the unique solution in $C^1(\mathbb{R}, L_\infty([0,1]))$ described above. We now introduce a continuum analogy of Definition 2.1.

Definition 4.2. Let $A \subseteq [0,1]$ of nonzero measure. We say that *consensus on A* is attained if

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{(x,y) \in A^2} |u(x,t) - u(y,t)| = 0. \tag{4.3}$$

If $A = [0,1]$ then we say *consensus* is attained.

Example 4.3. The constant 1-valued graphon attains consensus for every $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$, while, the constant -1-valued kernel reaches consensus if and only if $\boldsymbol{g}$ is a constant valued function. $\diamond$

By applying Medvedev's convergence result [15, Theorem 5.2] we justify the use of the continuum limit (4.1). We show that under certain conditions the continuum limit approximates the solutions to the voting model on sufficiently large graphs. First consider an IVP in the form of (4.1) with kernel W and initial condition function $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$. We define a sequence of IVPs with the n-th IVP corresponding to the voting model on the graph H_n (as defined in Example 3.5) and initial condition $\boldsymbol{g}_n$ defined below:

$$g_n(x) = \int_{\frac{i-1}{n}}^{\frac{i}{n}} g(y)\,dy \qquad \text{for each } i \in [n] \text{ and for all } x \in I_i^n, \tag{4.4}$$

where $I_i^n = \left(\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}\right]$. This can naturally be interpreted as a vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$, say $\boldsymbol{g}^{(n)}$ for each n. Where the i-th component of the vector $\boldsymbol{g}^n$ is the value of the function $\boldsymbol{g}_n$ on I_i^n.

Thus, the n-th approximate IVP is

$$\begin{cases} \frac{du_i^n(t)}{dt} & = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij}^n\big(u_j^n(t) - u_i^n(t)\big) \qquad \text{for all } i \in [n] \text{ and } t \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}, \\ \boldsymbol{u}^n(0) & = \boldsymbol{g}^{(n)}. \end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

This is equivalent to the continuum IVP with step kernel $W_n = W_{H_n}$ (see (3.1)) and step function $\boldsymbol{g}_n$ (described in (4.4))

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u_n(x,t)}{\partial t} & = \int_0^1 W_n(x,y)\big(u_n(t) - u_n(t)\big)\,dy \qquad \text{for all } x \in [0,1] \text{ and } t \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}, \\ \boldsymbol{u}_n(x,0) & = \boldsymbol{g}_n(x), \end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

in the sense that $u_n(x,t) = u_i^n(t)$ for all $x \in I_i^n$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$ and let $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$. Define $\boldsymbol{g}_n$ and W_n for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as in (4.4) and Example 3.5, respectively. Then*

$$\|\boldsymbol{g} - \boldsymbol{g}_n\|_2 \to 0 \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \|W - W_n\|_2 \to 0,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the $L_2([0,1])$ norm.

Proof. The second result was proven in Example 3.5 and the first follows similarly. $\square$

In a similar manner to (4.2), we define the $C([0,T];L_2([0,1]))$-norm as follows: let $\boldsymbol{u} \in C([0,T];L_2([0,1]))$ then

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{C([0,T];L_2([0,1]))} = \max_{t\in[0,T]} \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2.$$

We now present a key result, which follows as an application of [15, Theorem 5.2].

Theorem 4.5. *Let $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$ and let $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$. If $\{\boldsymbol{u}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of solutions to IVPs of the form (4.1) with initial conditions functions $\{\boldsymbol{g_n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq L_\infty([0,1])$ and kernels $\{W_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{u}$ is a solution to the IVP (4.1) with initial condition $\boldsymbol{g}$ and kernel W, then for any $0 < T < \infty$*

$$\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_n\|_{C([0,T];L_2([0,1]))} \leq \left(\|\boldsymbol{g} - \boldsymbol{g}_n\|_2^2 + \frac{C_1\|W - W_n\|_2}{C_2} \right) \exp(C_2 T), \tag{4.7}$$

where C_1, C_2 are positive constants independent of n. Furthermore, if each W_n and $\boldsymbol{g}_n$ is given by the construction in Example 3.5 and (4.4) then for any $0 < T < \infty$

$$\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_n\|_{C([0,T];L_2([0,1]))} \to 0 \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

For the voting model, Theorem 4.5 shows that solutions to the IVP (4.5) can be approximated by the graph limit IVP (4.1). However, in general replacing IVPs on sequences of convergent graphs with the IVP on their graph limit does not guarantee convergence [18].

In Lemma 3.8, we showed that the graph limit of a convergent sequence of graphs was robust to $o(n^2)$-perturbations (recall Definition 3.7). We now extend this notion to solutions of IVPs on graphs. This result will provide a neat extension of Theorem 4.5 which may be useful in an applied setting where the approximate graphs H_n are only known within a certain degree of accuracy. Alternatively, we may also interpret $o(n^2)$-perturbations of IVPs (to be defined below) as small random shocks to the dynamical system, which has also become a recent focus in applied research ([10, Section 11.4] and [17]).

Definition 4.6. Given a sequence of edge-weighted graphs $\{H_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ on vertex sets $[n]$ and a sequence of initial condition vectors $\boldsymbol{g}^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we can define a sequence of IVPs each of the form given by (2.3). Let $\{H'_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a $o(n^2)$-perturbation of the graph sequence $\{H_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. The *$o(n^2)$-perturbed sequence of IVPs* is the sequence of IVPs attained by replacing each H_n with H'_n in the IVPs of the form (2.3) for each n. Note that the initial condition vector for each IVP remains unchanged.

We can equivalently consider these two sequences of IVPs on graphs as sequences of IVPs on step kernels with initial conditions given by step functions. In particular for each n, the

step kernels are given by $W_n = W_{H_n}$ and $W'_n = W_{H'_n}$ (see 3.1) and initial condition step function for each $i \in [n]$ is defined as

$$g(x) = g_i^{(n)} \qquad \text{for all } x \in \Big(\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}\Big].$$

To distinguish between the two solutions we use superscript $\boldsymbol{u}^n$ to denote the vector-valued solution and the subscript $\boldsymbol{u}_n$ to denote the solution with image in $L_\infty([0,1])$.

Corollary 4.7. *Let $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$ and let $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$. If $\boldsymbol{u}$ is a solution to the IVP (4.1) and $\boldsymbol{u}'_n$ is the sequence of solutions to the sequence of $o(n^2)$-perturbed IVPs described in (4.6) then for any $0 < T < \infty$*

$$\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}'_n\|_{C([0,T];L_2([0,1]))} \to 0 \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Proof. First apply the bound on $\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}'_n\|_{C([0,T];L_2([0,1]))}$ given by 4.7 in Theorem 4.5; that is,

$$\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}'_n\|_{C([0,T];L_2([0,1]))} \le \left(\|\boldsymbol{g} - \boldsymbol{g}_n\|_2^2 + \frac{C_1 \|W - W'_n\|_2}{C_2} \right) \exp(C_2 T),$$

for some positive constants C_1, C_2 independent of n. Then the triangle inequality for $\|W - W'_n\|_2$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}'_n\|_{C([0,T];L_2([0,1]))} \\ &\le \left(\|\boldsymbol{g} - \boldsymbol{g}_n\|_2^2 + \frac{C_1\big(\|W - W_n\|_2 + \|W_n - W'_n\|_2\big)}{C_2} \right) \exp(C_2 T). \end{aligned}$$

This can be made arbitrarily small for large n by (3.7) and Lemma 4.4. □

The theory of graph limits identifies graphs and kernels which have a cut distance of zero apart via the weakly isomorphic relation. A natural question to ask of the voting model is whether this identification also leads to similar dynamics. To the best of our knowledge, this relationship has not been studied elsewhere.

First, recall the pull-back of a kernel. Given a measure-preserving map $\varphi \in S[0,1]$, we similarly define the pull-back of the function $u : [0,1] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$u^\varphi(x,t) = u(\varphi(x), t) \qquad \text{and} \qquad g^\varphi(x) = g(\varphi(x)).$$

Proposition 4.8. *Let $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$ and let $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$. If $\boldsymbol{u}$ is the solution to the IVP (4.1) with W and $\boldsymbol{g}$ then for any measure-preserving map $\varphi \in S[0,1]$, $\boldsymbol{u}^\varphi$ solves the IVP (4.1) with W^φ and $\boldsymbol{g}^\varphi$.*

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be a solution of the IVP with W and $\boldsymbol{g}$; that is, $\boldsymbol{u} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, L_\infty([0,1]))$ and

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u(x,t)}{\partial t} &= \int_0^1 W(x,y)\Big(u(y,t) - u(x,t)\Big)dy \qquad \text{for all } x \in [0,1] \text{ and } t \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}, \\ \boldsymbol{u}(0) &= \boldsymbol{g}. \end{cases} \tag{4.8}$$

For an arbitrary measure-preserving map $\varphi \in S[0,1]$, we also have that $\boldsymbol{u}^\varphi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, L_\infty([0,1]))$. So to prove the proposition it suffices to show that $\boldsymbol{u}^\varphi$ satisfies the conditions of (4.8) with W and $\boldsymbol{g}$ replaced with W^φ and $\boldsymbol{g}^\varphi$, respectively. That is,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u^\varphi(x,t)}{\partial t} &= \int_0^1 W^\varphi(x,y)\Big(u^\varphi(y,t) - u^\varphi(x,t)\Big)dy \qquad \text{for all } \ t \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}, \\ \boldsymbol{u}^\varphi(0) &= \boldsymbol{g}^\varphi. \end{cases} \tag{4.9}$$

Starting with the right hand side of the first condition of (4.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^1 W^\varphi(x,y)\big(u^\varphi(y,t) - u^\varphi(x,t)\big)\,dy \\ &= \int_0^1 W(\varphi(x),\varphi(y))\big(u(\varphi(y),t) - u(\varphi(x),t)\big)\,dy. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Since $\varphi \in S[0,1]$ is a measure-preserving map we have that: for all integrable functions $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$

$$\int_0^1 f(\varphi(x))\,dx = \int_0^1 f(x)\,dx. \tag{4.11}$$

Thus, applying (4.11) to (4.10) we attain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^1 W^\varphi(x,y)\big(u^\varphi(y,t) - u^\varphi(x,t)\big)\,dy \\ &= \int_0^1 W(\varphi(x),y)\big(u(y,t) - u(\varphi(x),t)\big)\,dy && \text{by 4.11,} \\ &= \frac{\partial u(w,t)}{\partial t}\bigg|^{w=\varphi(x)} && \text{by (4.8),} \\ &= \frac{\partial u^\varphi(x,t)}{\partial t} && \text{since } \varphi \text{ does not act on } t. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first condition in (4.9). The second condition $\boldsymbol{u}^\varphi(0) = \boldsymbol{g}^\varphi$ follows directly from the second condition in (4.8). This completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.9. *Let $W, U \in \mathcal{W}_1$ such that $W \sim U$ and let $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$. If $\boldsymbol{u}$ is the solution to the IVP (4.1) with W and $\boldsymbol{g}$ then there exists two measure-preserving maps $\varphi, \phi \in S[0,1]$ such that $\boldsymbol{u}^\varphi$ solves the IVP (4.1) with U^ϕ and $\boldsymbol{g}^\varphi$.*

Proof. Since $W \sim U$ there exists two measure-preserving maps $\varphi, \phi \in S[0,1]$ such that $W^{\varphi} = U^{\phi}$ almost everywhere (Theorem 3.4). Thus, the lemma follows from Proposition 4.8 by replacing W^{φ} with U^{ϕ}. □

Corollary 4.10. *Let $W, U \in \mathcal{W}_1$ be step kernels and $\boldsymbol{u}$ be the solution of the IVP (4.1) for some initial condition function $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$. If $W \sim U$ then there exists an invertible measure preserving map $\psi \in S[0,1]$ such that $\boldsymbol{u}^{\psi}$ solves the IVP (4.1) with U and $\boldsymbol{g}^{\psi}$.*

Proof. Since W and U are weakly isomorphic step kernels by Theorem 3.4 there exists two invertible measure preserving maps φ, ϕ such that $W^{\varphi} = U^{\phi}$ almost everywhere. Define $\psi = \varphi \circ \phi$ which is again an invertible measure-preserving map and $W^{\psi} = U$ almost everywhere. Applying Proposition 4.8 with ψ then completes the proof. □

5 Connected components and decomposing solutions

This section will present some basic properties of solutions to the continuum voting model. These include the Conservation Law which follows from [16, Lemma 3.5] and a result which decomposes the solutions of the continuum IVP (4.1) into solutions on the connected components of a kernel.

Lemma 5.1. (Conservation Law)
Let $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$ be a kernel and let $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$. If $\boldsymbol{u}$ is the solution of the IVP (4.1) then

$$\int_0^1 u(x,t)\,dx = \int_0^1 g(x)\,dx \qquad \text{for any } 0 \leq t < \infty. \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. This proof follows similarly to that of [16, Lemma 3.5]. □

In the finite setting it can be shown that the dynamics of the model on connected components of the graph are self-contained. This is a convenient result since, without loss of generality, it can be assumed that the graph on which the dynamics occur is connected. We now extend this characterisation to the continuum limit, utilising the definition of connectedness provided in Definition 3.9.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$. If $\boldsymbol{u}$ solves the IVP (4.1) then there exists a countable family of positive real numbers $\{a_i\}_{i\in I}$ and a unique family of functions in $\{\boldsymbol{u}_i\}_{i\in I} \subseteq C^1(\mathbb{R}, L_\infty([0,1]))$ such that*

$$\boldsymbol{u}(t) = \bigoplus_{i\in I} a_i \boldsymbol{u}_i(t),$$

where $\boldsymbol{u}_i$ are solutions to the IVP (4.1) on a connected kernel. We interpret this direct sum in a similar way to Definition 3.10: partition $[0,1]$ into intervals J_i of length a_i for $i \in I$. Then letting ϕ_i denote the positive affine map from J_i to $[0,1]$ (see 3.8) we have

$$u(x,t) = \begin{cases} u_i(\phi_i(x),t) & \text{if } x \in J_i,\ i = 1, 2, \dots, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. First, decompose the kernel $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$ into a direct sum of connected kernels as in Lemma 3.11; that is,

$$W = \bigoplus_{i \in I} a_i W_i$$

for a family of connected kernels $\{W_i\}_{i\in I} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_1$ and corresponding family of positive real numbers $\{a_i\}_{i\in I}$ with $\sum_{i\in I} a_i = 1$. Let $\{J_i\}_{i\in I}$ denote the partition of $[0,1]$ into intervals of length a_i and let ϕ_i denote the positive affine map from J_i to $[0,1]$ (see 3.8).

Define the *normalised degree function* of $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$ as

$$d_W(x) = \int_0^1 W(x,y)\,dy. \tag{5.2}$$

Then via an integrating factor it can be shown that the solution to the continuum model (4.1) solves

$$u(x,t) = e^{-d_W(x)t} g(x) + \int_0^t \int_0^1 e^{d_W(x)(s-t)} W(x,y) u(y,s)\,dy\,ds. \tag{5.3}$$

For an arbitrary element $x \in J_i$ (see Definition 3.10), $d_W(x)$ can be simplified as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} d_W(x) &= \int_0^1 W(x,y)\,dy \\ &= \int_{J_i} W_i(\phi_i(x),\,\phi_i(y))\,dy && \text{see (3.10),} \\ &= \frac{1}{a_i}\int_0^1 W_i(\phi_i(x),z)\,dz && \text{substitute } y \text{ with } \phi_i^{-1}(z), \\ &= d_{\widehat{W}_i}(\phi_i(x)) && \text{where we define } \widehat{W}_i = \frac{1}{a_i} W. \end{aligned}$$

For $x \in J_i$, the solution (5.3) then becomes

$$u(x,t) = e^{-d_{\widehat{W}_i}(\phi_i(x))t}\, g(x) + \int_0^t \int_{J_i} e^{d_{\widehat{W}_i}(\phi_i(x))(s-t)}\, W_i(\phi_i(x),\phi_i(y))\, u(y,s)\,dy\,ds$$

$$= e^{-d_{\widehat{W}_i}(\phi_i(x))t}\, g(x) + \int_0^t \int_0^1 e^{d_{\widehat{W}_i}(\phi_i(x))(s-t)}\, \widehat{W}_i(\phi_i(x), z)\, u(\phi_i^{-1}(z), s)\, dz\, ds$$
$$= e^{-d_{\widehat{W}_i}(\phi_i(x))t}\, g^{\phi_i^{-1}}(\phi_i(x)) + \int_0^t \int_0^1 e^{d_{\widehat{W}_i}(\phi_i(x))(s-t)}\, \widehat{W}_i(\phi_i(x), z)\, u^{\phi_i^{-1}}(z, s)\, dz\, ds,$$

where, again, we substitute y with $\phi_i^{-1}(z)$. Thus for all $x \in J_i$,

$$u^{\phi_i^{-1}}(x,t) = e^{-d_{\widehat{W}_i}(x)t}\, g^{\phi_i^{-1}}(x) + \int_0^t \int_0^1 e^{d_{\widehat{W}_i}(x)(s-t)}\, \widehat{W}_i(x, z)\, u^{\phi_i^{-1}}(z, s)\, dz\, ds. \tag{5.4}$$

But the function which solves (5.4) is the unique solution to the IVP (4.1) in $C^1(\mathbb{R}, L_\infty([0,1]))$ with connected kernel $\widehat{W}_i$ and initial condition function $\boldsymbol{g}^{\phi_i^{-1}}$. Thus, by defining $\boldsymbol{u}_i$ as the solution to the IVP (4.1) with connected kernel $\widehat{W}_i$ and initial condition function $\boldsymbol{g}^{\phi_i^{-1}}$, we have

$$u^{\phi_i^{-1}}(x,t) = u_i(x,t) \qquad \text{for all } x \in J_i,$$
$$\text{and so} \quad u(x,t) = u_i(\phi_i(x), t) \qquad \text{for all } x \in J_i.$$

Compactly, we can express this result as

$$\boldsymbol{u}(t) = \bigoplus_{i \in I} a_i \boldsymbol{u}_i(t), \qquad \text{as required.} \qquad \square$$

It was shown by Janson [11] that any sequence of graphs converging to a connected graph limit will eventually have minimal cuts growing at a rate proportional to n^2. In our context, the following equivalent lemma is more relevant.

Lemma 5.3. (Reformulated from [11, Theorem 1.10])
Let $\{H_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of edge-weighted graphs converging to the graph limit $[W] \in \overline{\mathcal{W}}_1$. If $[W]$ is connected then for sufficiently large n, the step kernels W_{H_n} is also connected (in the sense of Definition 3.9).

This ensures that results for the continuum model (4.1) which rely on connectedness of the kernel also apply to the approximate IVP (4.6) when n is sufficiently large.

6 Reaching consensus

In Section 4 using the results of [15] we were able to show that the continuum voting model could be used to approximate the finite voting model for large graphs. However, this approximation is attained in the $C([0,T], L_2([0,1]))$-norm, and consensus of the continuum model

does not imply consensus of the finite model, even for large graphs. This leaves open the question of whether graph limit theory can be used to infer consensus in the finite voting model.

We now prove our main result which answers the above question in the affirmative. We show that if the solution to the continuum model (4.1) reaches consensus then solutions to the finite model (4.6) will be close to a constant function, for sufficiently large n and sufficiently large t. This provides motivation for the continued study of the continuum model and, in particular, the search for sufficient conditions which guarantee consensus. We then identify a class of graphons, called twin-graphons, which guarantee consensus.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be a solution to the IVP (4.1), with kernel $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$ and initial condition function $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$, and let $\boldsymbol{u}_n$ be the solution to the approximate IVP (4.6) for each positive integer n. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{u}$ reaches consensus on $[0,1]$ and let D be any positive real number. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and for all $c > 0$, there exists $T = T(\varepsilon)$ and a subset $S_t \subseteq [0,1]^2$ with $\lambda(S_t) < c^2$ such that for all sufficiently large n,*

$$|u_n(x,t) - u_n(y,t)| \leq \varepsilon \qquad \text{for all } (x,y) \in [0,1]^2 \setminus S_t \text{ and } t \in [T, T+D]. \tag{6.1}$$

Proof. For any positive integer n, applying the triangle inequality three times gives the following upper bound on the consensus equation namely, (4.3) with $A = [0,1]$, of $\boldsymbol{u}_n$, for any fixed $t \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{(x,y)\in[0,1]^2} |u_n(x,t) - u_n(y,t)| \\ &\quad \leq 2 \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{x\in[0,1]} |u_n(x,t) - u(x,t)| + \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{(x,y)\in[0,1]^2} |u(x,t) - u(y,t)|. \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

Since $\boldsymbol{u}$ reaches consensus, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $T > 0$ such that

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{(x,y)\in[0,1]^2} |u(x,t) - u(y,t)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \qquad \text{for all } \ t \geq T. \tag{6.3}$$

Let X be a random variable uniformly distributed in $[0,1]$, denoted as $X \sim U[0,1]$, and define the continuous-time processes $\{u(X,t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ and $\{u_n(X,t)\}_{t\geq 0}$. By Lemma 5.1, we have $\mathbb{E}[u(X,t) - u_n(X,t)] = \int \boldsymbol{g} - \int \boldsymbol{g}_n = 0$. Then Chebyshev's inequality [24, Section 7.3] gives, for all $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\Big[\big|u(X,t) - u_n(X,t)\big| > \varepsilon\Big] &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\big[\big(u(X,t) - u_n(X,t)\big)^2\big]}{\varepsilon^2} \\ &= \frac{\|\boldsymbol{u}(t) - \boldsymbol{u}_n(t)\|_2^2}{\varepsilon^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

Now for any $D > 0$, we have $\boldsymbol{u}_n \to \boldsymbol{u}$ in $C([0, T + D]; L_2([0, 1]))$-norm (Theorem 4.5), and from (6.4) we have

$$\max_{t\in[0,T+D]} \mathbb{P}\Big[\big|u(X,t) - u_n(X,t)\big| > \tfrac{\varepsilon}{3}\Big] \le \Big(\frac{3\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_n\|_{C([0,T+D];L_2([0,1])}}{\varepsilon}\Big)^2 \to 0, \tag{6.5}$$

for large n. Thus, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $c > 0$ there exists an N such that for all $n > N$,

$$\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_n\|_{C([0,T+D];L_2([0,1]))} < \frac{c\,\varepsilon}{3\sqrt{2}}. \tag{6.6}$$

Combining (6.4) and (6.6), we see that for each $t \in [0, T + D]$, the set

$$A_t = \Big\{x \in [0, 1] : \big|u(x, t) - u_n(x, t)\big| > \tfrac{\varepsilon}{3}\Big\}$$

has Lebesgue measure at most $c^2/2$. It follows that

$$S_t = \big\{(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 : x \in A_t \text{ or } y \in A_t\big\}$$

has Lebesgue measure strictly less than c^2.

Applying (6.2) and (6.3) we attain the required result: for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and for all $c > 0$ there exists a positive integer N such that for every $t \in [T, T + D]$, if $n > N$ then

$$|u_n(x, t) - u_n(y, t)| \le \varepsilon \qquad \text{for all } (x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 \backslash S_t. \qquad \square$$

Remark 6.2. It follows directly from Corollary 4.7 that the above theorem also applies to $o(n^2)$-perturbed sequences of IVPs (see Definition 4.6).

We now establish an almost everywhere pointwise limit for solutions to the continuum model.

Definition 6.3. Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be a solution to the IVP (4.1). We say that $\boldsymbol{u}$ is a *bounded solution* if

$$\sup_{t\ge0} \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_\infty = \sup_{t\ge0} \Big\{\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{x\in[0,1]} |u(x, t)|\Big\} < \infty.$$

In the continuum model, we prove that if $W \in \mathcal{W}_0$ is a graphon then the solution $\boldsymbol{u}$ is automatically bounded.

Lemma 6.4. *Let $W \in \mathcal{W}_0$ and let $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0, 1])$. If $\boldsymbol{u}$ solves the IVP (4.1) with W and $\boldsymbol{g}$ then*

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_\infty \le \|\boldsymbol{g}\|_\infty \qquad \textit{for all } t \ge 0.$$

Hence $\boldsymbol{u}$ is a bounded solution.

Proof. This follows similar arguments presented in the proof of [9, Lemma 2]. □

We now show that any bounded solution to the continuum model (4.1) is a continuous-time martingale.

Definition 6.5. A family of random variables $\{Z_t : t \geq 0\}$ is called a continuous-time *martingale* if

$$\mathbb{E}\big[Z_t \big| \{Z_r : 0 \leq r \leq s\}\big] = Z_s \qquad \text{for all } s < t. \tag{6.7}$$

Proposition 6.6. *Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be a solution to the IVP (4.1) with kernel $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$ and initial condition function $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$. If $\boldsymbol{u}$ is a bounded solution and $X \sim U[0,1]$ then the continuous-time process $\{Z_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ defined by $Z_t = u(X,t)$ is a bounded continuous-time martingale. Further, $\{Z_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ converges almost surely as $t \to \infty$.*

Proof. First note that by assumption the solution $\boldsymbol{u}$ is bounded and so Z_t is bounded. That is,

$$\sup_{t\geq 0} \mathbb{E}[|Z_t|] = \sup_{t\geq 0} \int_0^1 |u(x,t)|\, dx \leq \sup_{t\geq 0} \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_\infty < \infty.$$

Secondly, we have for all $x \in [0,1]$ and for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} u(x,t) &= g(x) + \int_0^t \int_0^1 W(x,y)\big(u(y,r) - u(x,r)\big)\, dy\, dr \\ &= u(x,s) + \int_s^t \int_0^1 W(x,y)\big(u(y,r) - u(x,r)\big)\, dy\, dr \quad \text{for any } 0 \leq s \leq t. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, taking the conditional expectation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z_t | \{Z_\tau, \tau \leq s\}] &= Z_s + \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_s^t \int_0^1 W(X,y)\big(u(y,r) - u(X,r)\big)\, dy\, dr \,\Big|\, \{Z_\tau, \tau \leq s\}\Big] \\ &= Z_s + \int_0^1 \int_s^t \int_0^1 W(x,y)\big(u(y,r) - u(x,r)\big)\, dy\, dr\, dx \\ &= Z_s + \int_0^1 \int_s^t \int_0^1 W(x,y)\, u(y,r)\, dy\, dr\, dx \\ &\quad - \int_0^1 \int_s^t \int_0^1 W(x,y)\, u(x,r)\, dy\, dr\, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since the integrands of the last two terms are absolutely integrable and bounded above by some positive constant, via Fubini's theorem [6, Thereom 2.37] we have that

$$\int_0^1 \int_s^t \int_0^1 W(x,y)\, u(y,r)\, dy\, dr\, dx - \int_0^1 \int_s^t \int_0^1 W(x,y)\, u(x,r)\, dy\, dr\, dx$$

$$= \int_s^t \left(\int_{[0,1]^2} W(x,y)\, u(y,r)\, dy\, dx - \int_{[0,1]^2} W(x,y)\, u(x,r)\, dx\, dy \right) dr.$$

Noting that W is symmetric we have that the above expression equals zero. Hence the necessary condition (6.7) holds and we have a continuous-time martingale.

The final claim in the corollary follows immediately from the Martingale Convergence Theorem [24, Theorem 11.5]. □

The final statement in the proposition above can equivalently be stated in deterministic terms: for all bounded solutions $\boldsymbol{u}$ to the IVP (4.1) the limit $\lim_{t\to\infty} u(x,t)$ exists for almost every $x \in [0,1]$, and the function $\lim_{t\to\infty} \boldsymbol{u}(t)$ is integrable.

We now define the following function:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{u}^* : [0,1] &\to \mathbb{R} \\ x &\mapsto \begin{cases} \lim_{t\to\infty} u(x,t) & \text{if the limit exists,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

It should be noted that the existence of $\lim_{t\to\infty} u(x,t)$ almost everywhere is not enough to ensure that consensus is attained. A trivial example is the constant 0-valued graphon, which will have $\boldsymbol{u}(t) = \boldsymbol{u}^* = \boldsymbol{g}$ for any initial condition function $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$.

We begin with two lemmas which show how the weak isomorphism property and consensus in the voting model are related.

Lemma 6.7. *Let $W, U \in \mathcal{W}_1$ be kernels such that $W \sim U$ and let $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$. Suppose that the solution to the IVP (4.1) with W and $\boldsymbol{g}$ reaches consensus then there exists two measure preserving maps $\varphi, \phi \in S[0,1]$ such that the solution to the IVP (4.1) with U^ϕ and $\boldsymbol{g}^\varphi$ reaches consensus. Furthermore, if W and U are step kernels then there exists an invertible measure preserving map $\psi \in S[0,1]$ such that the solution to the IVP (4.1) with U and $\boldsymbol{g}^\psi$ reaches consensus.*

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be the solution to the IVP (4.1) with W and $\boldsymbol{g}$. By Lemma 4.9 there exists two measure-preserving maps $\varphi, \phi \in S[0,1]$ such that $\boldsymbol{u}^\varphi$ solves the IVP (4.1) with U^ϕ and $\boldsymbol{g}^\varphi$. If $\boldsymbol{u}$ attains consensus (recall Definition 4.2) it follows that $\boldsymbol{u}^\varphi$ attains consensus. This completes the proof of the first claim. The final claim follows similarly by replacing the application of Lemma 4.9 with the application of Corollary 4.10. □

An invertible measure-preserving map is equivalent to a relabelling of the continuum of vertices and when applied to a step kernel W, it corresponds to a permutation of the vertices of a finite graph. Thus the final statment in Lemma 6.7 appears to be identical to the fact that relabelling the vertices of a finite graph does not change the behaviour of the IVP (2.3). However, Lemma 6.7 is more general since the initial condition function $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$ need not correspond to a finite length vector, as it need not be a step function.

The following proposition shows that if the solution to the voting model attains consensus then the constant which $\boldsymbol{u}(t)$ converges to, almost everwhere, is the average of the initial condition function over $[0,1]$.

Proposition 6.8. *Given a kernel $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$ and initial condition $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$, let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be a solution to the IVP (4.1) on W and $\boldsymbol{g}$. If $\boldsymbol{u}$ reaches consensus then*

$$\boldsymbol{u}^*(x) = \int_0^1 \boldsymbol{g}(y)\, dy \qquad \textit{for almost every } x \in [0,1].$$

Proof. By the Conservation Law (Lemma 5.1) we have

$$\int_0^1 u(x,t)dx = \int_0^1 g(y)\, dy \qquad \text{for all } 0 \le t < \infty. \tag{6.8}$$

If $\boldsymbol{u}$ reaches consensus then the limit $\boldsymbol{u}^*$ exists almost everywhere and is bounded. Taking the limit as t approaches infinity of (6.8) and applying the Dominated Convergence Theorem [6, Theorem 2.24] gives

$$\int_0^1 u^*(x)dx = \lim_{t\to\infty} \int_0^1 u(x,t)dx = \int_0^1 g(x)\, dx.$$

But $\boldsymbol{u}^*$ is constant almost everywhere, since $\boldsymbol{u}$ reaches consensus. Thus

$$\boldsymbol{u}^*(x) = \int_0^1 \boldsymbol{g}(y)\, dy \qquad \text{for almost every } x \in [0,1]. \qquad \square$$

We now introduce a class of kernels which will be shown to attain consensus.

Definition 6.9. Let $A \subseteq [0,1]$ with nonzero measure and let W be a kernel. We say that A is a *twin-set* of W if there exists a function $a : A \times A \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$W(x,y) = a(x,x')\, W(x',y) \qquad \text{for all } x, x' \in A \text{ and almost every } y \in [0,1].$$

We say a twin-set is *maximal* if for any twin-set B such that

$$A \subseteq B$$

then $B = A$. If W has a finite number of maximal twin-sets $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ such that

$$[0,1] = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} A_i$$

then we say that W is a *twin-kernel*. Here set equality means up to a set of measure zero.

Consider a twin-kernel W with twin-sets $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ such that $a_i(x,x') = 1$ for every $(x,x') \in A_i \times A_i$. Then we see that W is a step kernel. This shows that step kernels are a subset of twin-kernels. Given any nonzero function $f : [0,1] \to [-1,1]\backslash\{0\}$, the kernel $W(x,y) = f(x)\,f(y)$ is a twin-kernel with twin-set equal to $[0,1]$. This follows since for every $x,\ x' \in [0,1]$

$$W(x,y) = \frac{f(x)}{f(x')}\,W(x',y) \qquad \text{for almost every } y \in [0,1].$$

On the other hand, the kernel $W(x,y) = x + y$ does not have any twin-sets and so is not a twin-kernel.

Recall the normalised degree function, d_W (see 5.2).

Remark 6.10. Let W be a kernel with twin-sets A and B.

(i) Distinct maximal twin-sets are disjoint. That is, if A, B are maximal twin-sets such that $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ then $A \cup B$ is a twin-set containing A and B and so $A = B = A \cup B$.

(ii) If $x \in A$ then for all $x' \in A$ we have $d_W(x) = a(x,x')\,d_W(x')$; and either

$$\begin{aligned} d_W(x) &= 0 && \text{for all } x \in A; \text{ or,} \\ d_W(x) &\neq 0 && \text{for all } x \in A. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6.11. *Let $W \in \mathcal{W}_1$ with a twin-set A and let $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$. If $\boldsymbol{u}$ is a bounded solution to the IVP (4.1) and $d_W(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in A$ then*

$$u^*(x) = C \qquad \text{for almost every } x \in A, \tag{6.9}$$

where C is some constant. That is, $\boldsymbol{u}$ reaches consensus on A.

Proof. By assumption the solution $\boldsymbol{u}$ is bounded. This ensures the limit function $\boldsymbol{u}^*$ exists almost everywhere, by Proposition 6.6. Now fix an $x \in A$ such that $u^*(x)$ exists. Then by the Dominated Convergence Theorem [6, Theorem 2.24]

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} u'(x,\tau) = \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \frac{\partial u(x,t)}{\partial t}\Big|^{t=\tau}$$

$$= \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \int_0^1 W(x,y)\left(u(y,\tau) - u(x,\tau)\right) dy$$
$$= \int_0^1 \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \Big(W(x,y)\left(u(y,\tau) - u(x,\tau)\right)\Big) dy$$
$$= \int_0^1 W(x,y)\left(u^*(y) - u^*(x)\right) dy. \tag{6.10}$$

That is, the limit on the left hand side exists. So there exists a finite constant L such that

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \Big(u(x,\tau) + u'(x,\tau)\Big) = L.$$

This implies that $\lim_{\tau\to\infty} u'(x,\tau) = 0$, since L'Hôpital's rule gives

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} u(x,\tau) = \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \frac{e^\tau u(x,\tau)}{e^\tau} = \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \frac{e^\tau\big(u(x,\tau) + u'(x,\tau)\big)}{e^\tau} = L.$$

Thus, rearranging (6.10), gives the following 'stabilising condition'

$$d_W(x)\, u^*(x) = \int_0^1 W(x,y)\, u^*(y)\, dy. \tag{6.11}$$

Since $d_W(x) \neq 0$ by assumption, we can divide by $d_W(x)$ which gives

$$u^*(x) = \frac{1}{d_W(x)} \int_0^1 W(x,y)\, u^*(y)\, dy. \tag{6.12}$$

Let $x' \in A$ such that $u^*(x')$ exists. Then $d_W(x) = a(x,x')\, d_W(x')$ (see Remark 6.10(ii)) and

$$\int_0^1 W(x,y)\, u^*(y)\, dy = a(x,x') \int_0^1 W(x',y)\, u^*(y)\, dy.$$

Thus the right hand side of (6.12) is invariant for all elements in the same twin set, since the $a(x,x')$ term in the numerator and denominator cancels. Hence,

$$u^*(x) = u^*(x') \qquad \text{for almost every } x, x' \in A.$$

That is, $\boldsymbol{u}^*$ is almost everywhere constant on A. This proves (6.14). □

By restricting the above lemma to the set of graphons $\mathcal{W}_0$ we attain a more elegant result.

Lemma 6.12. *Let $W \in \mathcal{W}_0$ with a twin-set A and let $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0,1])$. If $\boldsymbol{u}$ is a solution to the IVP (4.1) then we have*

$$u^*(x) = g(x) \qquad \textit{for almost every } x \in A\textit{; or,} \tag{6.13}$$
$$u^*(x) = C \qquad \textit{for almost every } x \in A, \tag{6.14}$$

where C is some constant. In the latter case, $\boldsymbol{u}$ reaches consensus on A (recall Definition 4.2).

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be the solution the IVP (4.1) with graphon W and initial condition $\boldsymbol{g}$. First note that Remark 6.10 (ii) states that either $d_W(x) = 0$ for all $x \in A$, or $d_W(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in A$. In the first case, since $W \in \mathcal{W}_0$, this implies that for all $x \in A$ we have $W(x, y) = 0$ for almost every $y \in [0, 1]$. Thus, the solution of the IVP is $u(x, t) = g(x)$ for all $x \in A$. In the second case, we can apply Lemma 6.11 since $\boldsymbol{u}$ is automatically a bounded solution (see Lemma 6.4). This completes the proof. □

Recall that by Lemma 5.2 we can assume a kernel is connected without loss of generality.

Corollary 6.13. *Let $W \in \mathcal{W}_0$ be a connected twin-graphon and let $\boldsymbol{g} \in L_\infty([0, 1])$. If $\boldsymbol{u}$ solves the IVP (4.1) then $\boldsymbol{u}$ reaches consensus on $[0, 1]$ and $\boldsymbol{u}^* = \int \boldsymbol{g}$ almost everywhere.*

Proof. Note that $W \in \mathcal{W}_0$ and so by Lemma 6.4, $\boldsymbol{u}$ is a bounded solution. This guarantees the existence of $\boldsymbol{u}^*$ almost everywhere (see Proposition 6.6). Also W is a twin-graphon and so there exists a finite family of maximal twin-sets $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$, which are disjoint (see Remark 6.10 (i)). Thus, $[0, 1] = \dot{\cup}_{i=1}^n A_i$ almost everywhere.

Now since $W \in \mathcal{W}_0$ is connected, $d_W(x) \neq 0$ for almost every $x \in [0, 1]$. Thus, Lemma 6.11 states that $\boldsymbol{u}^*$ is almost everywhere constant on the twin-sets and so we have

$$u^*(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \mathbb{1}_{A_i}(x) \qquad \text{for some positive integer } n,$$

where $\mathbb{1}_A$ denotes the indicator function with respect to the set A. We can assume that $a_i \neq a_j$ for $i \neq j$, by taking set unions if this is not the case.

Suppose for the purpose of a contradiction that $\boldsymbol{u}^*$ is not constant. Then there exists $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ such that $a_i > a_j$ for all $j \neq i$. Since W is connected, there must exists a set $S \subseteq A_i$ of positive measure such that

$$\int_{A_i^c} W(x, y)\, dy > 0 \qquad \text{for all } x \in S. \tag{6.15}$$

Now fix $x \in S$. The stabilising condition (6.11) then gives

$$\begin{aligned} d_W(x) a_i &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j \int_{A_j} W(x, y)\, dy \\ &< a_i \sum_{j=1}^{n} \int_{A_j} W(x, y)\, dy \qquad \text{since } a_i > a_j \text{ for all } j \neq i \text{ and by (6.15)} \\ &= d_W(x)\, a_i, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Thus it must be the case that $\boldsymbol{u}^*$ is constant almost everywhere. If $\boldsymbol{u}^*$ is almost-everywhere constant then $\boldsymbol{u}$ reaches consensus on $[0,1]$. Applying Proposition 6.8 then gives the required result. □

The nonnegativity of the kernel (i.e. $W \in \mathcal{W}_0$) in Corollary 6.13 is essential. The following example shows that a connected, twin-kernel which takes negative values can have a non-constant limit: that is, consensus is never attained.

Example 6.14. Consider the edge-weighted graph G illustrated below



The kernel representing the graph W_G (see 3.1) is a connected twin-kernel. However, it takes negative values and so Corollary 6.13 does not apply since $W_G \notin \mathcal{W}_0$. Let $I_i = [\frac{i-1}{4}, \frac{i}{4}]$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Then any initial condition function $\boldsymbol{g}$ such that

$$\int_{I_i} g(y)dy = \int_{I_j} g(y)dy \qquad \text{for } (i,j) = (2,3) \text{ or } (i,j) = (1,4) \tag{6.16}$$

will force $\boldsymbol{u}(t) = \boldsymbol{g} = \boldsymbol{u}^*$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$. However, $\boldsymbol{g}$ need not be constant, and hence $\boldsymbol{u}(t)$ need not reach consensus. For example, the function

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} -1 + 4x & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ 3 - 4x & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < x \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

will satisfy (6.16). ◇

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge Catherine Greenhill's and Richard Holden's assistance in various aspects of this paper. I would also like to thank Georgi Medvedev and Oleg Pikhurko for their helpful comments on ealier drafts of this paper.

References

[1] D. Aldous, Interacting Particle Systems as Stochastic Social Dynamics, *Bernoulli*, **19** (2013), 1122–1149.

[2] C. Borgs, J. Chayes, L. Lovász, V.T. Sós and K. Vesztergombi, Convergent Sequences of Dense Graphs. I. Subgraph Frequencies, Metric Properties, and Testing, *Adv. Math.*, **219** (2008), 1801–1851.

[3] C. Borgs, J. Chayes, L. Lovász, V.T. Sós and K. Vesztergombi, Convergent Sequences of Dense Graphs. II. Multiway Cuts and Statistical Physics, *Ann. of Math. (2)*, **176** (2012), 151–219.

[4] R. Diestel, *Graph Theory*, Springer, Heidelberg, 4th ed., 2000.

[5] M. Dyer, G. Istrate, L.A. Goldberg, C. Greenhill and M. Jerrum, Convergence of the Iterated Prisoner's Dilemma Game, *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, **11** (2002), 135–147.

[6] G.B. Folland, *Real Analysis*, Wiley-Interscience Publication, 2nd ed., 1999.

[7] D.A. French, Z. Teymuroglu, T.J. Lewis and R.J. Braun, An Integro-Differential Equation Model for the Spread of Alcohol Abuse, *J. Integral Equations Appl.*, **22** (2010), 443–464.

[8] B. Golub and M.O. Jackson, Naive Learning in Social Networks: Convergence, Influence and the Wisdom of Crowds, *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, **2** (2010), 112–149.

[9] J.M. Hendrickx and A. Olshevsky, Symmetric Continuum Opinion Dynamics: Convergence, but sometimes only in Distribution, *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, **52** (2013), 1989–1994.

[10] M.O. Jackson, *Social and Economic Networks*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 2008.

[11] S. Janson, Connectedness in Graph Limits, *U.U.D.M. report*, ISSN 1101-3591, Department of Mathematics, Uppsala University (2008).

[12] L. Lovász, *Large Networks and Graph Limits*, American Mathematical Society, Rhode Island, 2012.

[13] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy, Limits of Dense Graph Sequences, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, **96** (2006), 933–957.

[14] J. Lunze, F. Lamnabhi-Lagarrigue and Others, *Handbook of Hybrid Systems Control: Theory, Tools, Applications*, Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[15] G.S. Medvedev, The Nonlinear Heat Equation on Dense Graphs and Graph Limits, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **46** (2014), 2743–2766.

[16] G.S. Medvedev, Small-world Networks of Kuramoto Oscillators, *Phys. D*, **266** (2014), 13–22.

[17] G.S. Medvedev, Stochastic stability of Continuous Time Consensus Protocols, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, **50** (2012), 1859–1885.

[18] G.S. Medvedev and X. Tang, Stability of Twisted States in the Kuramoto Model on Cayley and Random Graphs, *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, **25** (2015), 1169–1208.

[19] G.S. Medvedev and S. Zhuravytska, The Geometry of Spontaneous Spiking in Neuronal Networks, *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, **22** (2012), 689–725.

[20] O.E. Omelchenko, M. Wolfrum, S. Yanchuk, Y. Maistrenko and O. Sudakov, Stationary Patterns of Coherence and Incoherence in Two-dimensional Arrays of Non-locally-Coupled Phase Oscillators, *Phys. Rev. E (3)*, **85** (2012), 036210.

[21] R. Olfati-Saber and R.M. Murray, Consensus Protocols for Networks of Dynamics Agents, *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, June (2003).

[22] W. Ren, R.W. Beard and E.M. Atkins, Information Consensus in Multivehicle Cooperative Control, *IEEE Control Syst. Mag.*, **27** (2007), 71–82.

[23] D.A. Wiley, S.H. Strogatz and M. Girvan, The Size of the Sync Basin, *Chaos*, **16** (2006), 015103.

[24] D. Williams, *Probability with Martingales*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.